

- 5 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

**REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 22, 2003. By way of this amendment, claim 5 has been amended. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-19 are currently pending in the application. Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (6,353,734) in view of Bauer et al. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of exporting data from an engine condition monitoring program database to a destination database. The method includes extracting and exporting data that comprise engine configuration data, aircraft configuration data, engine input data, engine raw output data, engine smoothed output data, aircraft input data, aircraft raw output data, aircraft smoothed output data, alert data, initialization data and compressed data. Independent claim 5 recites a method of exporting data in a computer system having an engine condition monitoring program, a program database comprising a number of data tables and a destination database.

Wright et al discloses an aircraft data communication system in which a ground data link positioned within an aircraft includes a data store for storing flight performance data and engine data accumulated during a flight. After the aircraft lands, the stored data is downloaded to an airport based spread spectrum receiver. However, while Wright et al discloses "downloading" flight and engine data, the reference does not specifically teach that the data is exported from one database to another. In other words, the data is described as being stored on the aircraft, but once it merely described as being downloaded to the spread spectrum receiver for processing. There is no mention of the downloaded data actually being stored in a database. Even assuming for the

) ✓  
///

- 6 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

sake of argument that the downloaded data is stored in some manner, there is no mention of exporting the type of data recited in claims 1 and 5. That is, Wright et al mentions flight performance and engine data generally, but does not specifically describe exporting data including engine configuration data, engine input data, engine raw output data, engine smoothed output data, alert data, and initialization data, as required by independent claims 1 and 5.

The Examiner recognizes that Wright et al does not teach the claimed limitation of updating an external time file with the date and time of a successful export and asserts that it would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Wright et al and Bauer et al. Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to combine these references because there is insufficient motivation in the prior art to make the combination set forth by the Examiner. The Examiner states that Bauer's recording of the time and date of updates would allow users of the Wright system to particularly identify when data from the aircraft was downloaded to the ground. However, as pointed out by the Examiner, Wright et al already suggests that the data is downloaded after each flight. In light of this, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to separately record the time and date of each download. In the present invention, the time and date of a successful export is recorded so that only new data are exported in subsequent exports. Wright et al, on the other hand, provides no suggestion that less than all of the data is downloaded each time. Thus, there would be no reason to be concerned with identifying new data.

Lastly, claim 5 as amended, recites that the program database and the destination database are part of a single computer system. In the present invention, data is downloaded from an aircraft data recorder 14 to the program database 20 of ground-based computer system 16. Data is exported from the program database 20 to the destination database 24 in the same computer system 16. In Wright et al, data is downloaded from a computer system on the

- 7 -

Serial No. 09/637,442

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13511

aircraft to a separate ground-based system. There is no exporting of data between databases in a single computer system.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1 and 5 are allowable over Wright et al in view of Bauer et al. Each of claims 2 and 8-19 depends from independent claim 1 or 5 and is thus believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1, 2, 5 and 8-19 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

1/22/04  
Date

Patrick R. Scanlon  
Patrick R. Scanlon  
Reg. No. 34,500  
207-791-1276